

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 761

VT 020 092

AUTHOR Ptacek, Carmen
TITLE An Evaluation of the Teacher Training Program for Consumer Homemaking Education in Utah.
INSTITUTION Utah State Board of Education, Salt Lake City. Div. of Research and Innovation.
PUB DATE Feb 72
NOTE 41p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Home Economics Education; *Home Economics Teachers; *Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; Relevance (Education); *Teacher Education; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS *Utah

ABSTRACT

To identify inadequacies or irrelevancies in the home economics training program for teachers in Utah and to suggest methods of correcting them, data were collected from senior students in home economics education, cooperating teachers, and practicing secondary teachers who graduated from Utah State University, University of Utah, and Brigham Young University. Data were gathered by means of: (1) a rating scale for adequacy and relevancy of college training, which was sent to the practicing secondary teachers, (2) an open-ended questionnaire, which was sent to senior students and cooperating teachers, (3) a review of tape recordings made by 16 senior students, and (4) a comparison of secondary curriculum guides and university course outlines. In general, the programs were found to be very good in most areas, but some areas need improvement. Some recommendations for improvement were: (1) Teaching methods taught should be as specific to the subject area as possible, (2) A course in gainful home economics should be required, (3) The program should be made more flexible to meet individual needs, (4) Consumer decision-making should be emphasized in all areas, not just in one class, and (5) Students should get more drug education.
(Author/SB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076761

AN EVALUATION OF THE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM
FOR CONSUMER HOMEMAKING EDUCATION IN UTAH

Utah State Board of Education
1972

VT020092

ED 076761

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AN EVALUATION OF THE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM
FOR CONSUMER HOMEMAKING EDUCATION IN UTAH

Utah State Board of Education
1972

AN EVALUATION OF THE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM
FOR CONSUMER HOMEMAKING EDUCATION IN UTAH

Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Walter D. Talbot, State Superintendent
Lerue Winget, Deputy Superintendent for Instruction

Division of Research and Innovation
Quentin E. Utley, Administrator
G. Warren Gaddis, Project Director
Carmen Ptacek, Principal Investigator

Salt Lake City
February 1972

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
1400 University Club Building
136 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Mrs. Helen B. Ure, Chairman
3105 Imperial Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84106

Arthur H. Lee, Vice-Chairman
Bicknell, Utah 84715

Sheldon S. Allred
219 North Carbon Avenue
Price, Utah 84501

Mrs. Erna S. Ericksen
1455 Military Way
Salt Lake City, Utah 84103

Mrs. Esther R. Landa
5006 South 1034 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84117

A. Reed Morrill
895 North 150 East
Provo, Utah 84601

John L. Owen
1100 South 2nd West
Wellsville, Utah 84339

N. Russell Tanner
1744 - 24th Street
Ogden, Utah 84401

Karl I. Truman
Minersville, Utah 84752

Walter D. Talbot, Executive Officer
Salt Lake City, Utah


LaPreal Wight, Secretary
Salt Lake City, Utah

FOREWORD

This publication is a report of a study designed to help teacher education departments and home economics college subject matter specialists in the three designated universities to evaluate their specific offerings basic to effective secondary teacher preparation.

Seventy-one secondary teachers in Utah and fifty-three senior students who had completed their student teaching participated in the study.

It is anticipated that as a result of this study the institutions involved will analyze the findings and increase the effectiveness of their present offerings to meet the needs of those in preservice teacher training.



Walter D. Talbot
Superintendent of Public Instruction

PREFACE

The need for the study was identified both on university campuses and through state supervisory visits.

On the university campuses students returning from student teaching experiences evaluated the adequacy of their basic training in relation to the teaching needs which they had encountered. Cooperating teachers who had worked with students from all three universities expressed concern for adequacy of basic teaching skills found in student teachers. Teachers with from one to five years experience were asking for in-service help in many areas where they felt their background was inadequate.

To determine the facts and to provide a basis on which change at the university level could be attained, a detailed analysis of relevancy and adequacy of the teacher training program in Utah for teachers of home economics at the secondary level was instigated. Seventy-one secondary teachers and fifty-three senior college students were included in the study whose basic training had been obtained from Brigham Young University, University of Utah, or Utah State University.

This study, as reported, includes a review of curriculum guides currently in use in the Utah Schools. This review was compared with the course content of university classes and neglected areas of content were identified. The study also includes a summary of a tape recording of students' feeling of adequacy which was made immediately upon return from student teaching experience.

An open-ended questionnaire was circulated to the cooperating teachers and first, third, and fifth year teachers who had graduated from the three institutions. Also, an open-ended questionnaire and rating scale was completed by the student teachers during winter quarter.

Upon publication of the study conferences will be held at each university with concerned staff to suggest improvement in areas identified.

C. Aileen Ericksen
State Specialist
Home Economics Education

MEMORANDUM OF CAUTION

TO: Whom It May Concern

FROM: Division of Research and Development
Utah State Board of Education

This publication is being distributed on a limited basis and, though complete in itself as a report of a part of the problem, should be used for discussion purposes only and to stimulate critical thinking about the subject which it reports.

Because the study lacks needed objectivity in both student outcomes and teacher performances, it is felt that unqualified acceptance and distribution of the report should be discouraged. In addition, some terms frequently used are rather ill-defined and some gaps exist in data reporting; e.g., "adequacy," "relevancy"; numbers of respondents expressing a given satisfaction or dissatisfaction, etc.

Nevertheless, the study should be taken seriously, and consideration should be given to continuing similar, and perhaps more sophisticated, efforts in evaluating the state's teacher training programs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	iii
PREFACE	iv
MEMORANDUM OF CAUTION	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Goals of the Study	1
Procedure	1
FINDINGS	5
Analysis of Curriculum Guides and Course Outlines	5
Analysis of Tape Recording	7
Analysis of Open-ended Questions Given to Cooperating Teachers	8
Analysis of Open-ended Questions Given to Senior Home Economics Education Students	12
Analysis of Comments Made by Secondary Teachers	17
Summary of Comparisons Between the Three Schools	20
Analysis of Rating Scale	21
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	31
Scope of the Study	31
Findings	31
Recommendations	31

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The problem was to conduct an evaluation of the teacher training programs for consumer homemaking education in the State of Utah.

Goals of the Study

The general goals of this study were:

1. To identify inadequacies or irrelevancies in the home economics training program for teachers in Utah; and,
2. To suggest methods of correcting inadequacies discovered or adjusting irrelevancies.

Procedure

Sample

The sample utilized for this study consisted of all senior students in home economics education from the University of Utah, Utah State University, and Brigham Young University; cooperating teachers in the local schools who supervise student teachers from each of these schools; and secondary teachers of home economics who graduated from one of these schools and had taught for one, three, or five years. Because there were few fifth year teachers among the respondents, the fifth year teachers were grouped with the third year teachers for purposes of evaluation. Table 1 shows the composition of the sample for this study.

Table 1

Composition of the Sample

School	Senior Students	Cooperating Teachers*	Secondary Teachers
U of U	7	12	17
USU	31	26	24
BYU	<u>15</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>31</u>
Total	<u>53</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>71</u>

*Some cooperating teachers are included in the sample from more than one school because they had student teachers from more than one university.

Instruments

Open-ended questions. Open-ended questions were used to obtain data from the senior students and cooperating teachers. Questionnaires for these groups were sent to the home economics education departments in each of the universities included in the study and were distributed by department personnel.

The questions given to the senior students were:

1. Which, if any, of the courses you were required to take were a waste of time?
2. What duplications have you noticed in your course work?
3. What apprehensions did you or do you feel towards student teaching?
4. How can your training be improved to help relieve these apprehensions?

5. Do you have any other comments or suggestions regarding your training in home economics education?

The questions given to the cooperating teachers were:

1. Have you noticed any areas in which most of your student teachers seem to be weak? If so, which areas?
2. In what areas do your student teachers appear very well trained?
3. What suggestions do you have for improving the teacher training program for home economics?

Rating scale. A rating scale was sent to the selected secondary teachers of home economics through the mail. The scale consisted of 71 items. Each item was concerned with an area of homemaking which is taught on the secondary level. The teachers rated each item according to the relevancy and adequacy of her college training, with 5 representing the most adequate and relevant and 1 representing the least. A separate response was required for relevancy and for adequacy. For the purposes of this study, adequacy was defined as the degree to which a complete and well-rounded program was available. Relevancy was defined as the degree to which the subject matter was presented in harmony with one's needs as a secondary teacher. Space was provided on the scale for any other comments the teacher wished to give.

Tape recording. A recording was made of 16 senior students from Utah State University who had recently completed student teaching. They discussed their training in college and how it could be improved.

Secondary curriculum guides for homemaking and course outlines from the universities. A comparison was made between the secondary

curriculum guides currently in use in the State of Utah and course outlines used by teachers of home economics classes in each of the three universities. This was to identify areas that were being neglected on the college level.*

Analysis

Means, correlations, and analysis of variance were the chief statistics employed in analyzing the rating scale responses. The comments and response to the open-ended questions were analyzed for frequency of mention. Reviews of the curriculum guides, course outlines, and tape recordings were examined for repeated evidence of the need for improvement in some areas and for further insight into the training programs as presently offered.

*Utah State Board for Vocational Education, Secondary Curriculum Guide for Homemaking (Salt Lake City, Utah, 1965).

Utah State Board for Vocational Education, Topical Outlines for Homemaking (Salt Lake City, Utah, 1969).

Utah State Board for Vocational Education, Project SUCCESS Homemaking Curriculums (Salt Lake City, Utah, 1970).

FINDINGS

Analysis of Curriculum Guides and Course Outlines

Reviews were made of the curriculum guides currently in use in Utah for secondary homemaking classes. These were compared with the course content of college classes at the University of Utah, Utah State University, and Brigham Young University. Table 2 lists the areas found to be neglected or inadequate in college training. For the most part, these areas were the same in all three schools.

Table 2

Neglected Areas in College Training*

Foods and Nutrition	Clothing and Textiles	Personal Development
Foreign foods Social context of foods Buying food Convenience foods All aspects of food service Proper storage of foods Correct measuring procedures and other basic skills Cake decorating	Mending Needlecraft Use of power machines Altering ready-made clothes Buying clothes Working with new or special fabrics Equipment for sewing (including machine repair)	Careers Drugs, alcohol Grooming, posture Some aspects of home nursing, diseases Student organization
Child and Family	Housing, Management, and Finance	
Other cultures, family life styles Friendship	Consumer problems Flower arrangement Making drapes, upholstering Methods for many household tasks	

*Not listed in order of importance.

Most of the areas listed in Table 2 as being neglected are the "extras" which teachers of home economics find themselves teaching. Most of the basic principles taught on the secondary level are also being taught on the college level. However, if possible some training should also be given in these neglected areas.

The new emphasis in high school home economics has shifted from productive skills such as cooking and sewing to one of consumer skills such as decision making. While all three schools offer training in this area, it is not comprehensive enough to meet the needs of a homemaking teacher who is teaching consumer education. More information needs to be provided on what to look for when making specific decisions affecting the total family value pattern.

Utah State University appears to be lacking in the area of laundry. It is touched on only briefly and does not provide the prospective teacher with the multitude of information that is needed to understand the many types of laundry products available today and the different kinds of care required for various new fabrics.

The University of Utah offers several courses which all homemaking teachers need to take, but they are listed as options and not all students get the necessary training in these areas. This includes food preservation and deterioration, housing, equipment, and consumer buying. Some of these could be incorporated into other classes or taught in short credit classes (less than three hours per week), but all are necessary.

All areas of gainful home economics education are badly neglected, almost non-existent, in present college programs. The exception is training for a day care aide which is easily assimilated in the nursery school experience.

Analysis of Tape Recording

The tape recording* dealt with three major areas. They were training in clothing, the need for chemistry, and the assistance given to them by cooperating teachers.

The majority of the students gave the impression that teaching clothing presented them with more problems than did most of the other areas. Many felt they lacked the basic skills necessary to teach in this area. These students indicated the need for acquiring certain basic skills before advancing to another class. There was also strong support for the idea of a class or part of a class devoted to methods of teaching clothing. Helping secondary students with fitting problems in clothing construction appeared to be a major problem for many of the student teachers.

The debate on the question of the necessity of requiring fifteen credits of chemistry ended without all students agreeing; most of them felt that while some chemistry is necessary, most of the time presently spent on chemistry is wasted. They indicated that they worried so much about chemistry that they often did poorly in other subjects. Many said they did not retain much from the chemistry classes they had taken and complained that the classes were not oriented to the home economics major. Few favored dropping chemistry completely. Many liked the idea of a chemistry class taught specifically for home economics majors. Organic chemistry was considered to be more important than inorganic. Some argued that reducing the chemistry requirement would make home economics something "anybody" could take. Most students were not satisfied with chemistry in its present form.

*Transcript can be made available if desired through the Utah State Board of Education, Division of Vocational Education.

The discussion with students concerning experiences with cooperating teachers showed that the teachers were quite divergent in the methods they used with their student teachers. Some were seldom in the room, others never left. Some required things be done just their way, while others gave their student teachers free rein. Some of the students felt they had been at a disadvantage with their particular cooperating teacher. Even though teachers are required to have in-service training to become cooperating teachers, such training sessions have not contributed greatly to clearing up some of these problems. Cooperating teachers are not operating under comparable guidelines, and this seems to be primarily the result of differing requirements of the teacher training institutions.

Analysis of Open-ended Questions Given
to Cooperating Teachers

University of Utah

Table 3 lists the answers given most often to the open-ended questions by the cooperating teachers who had student teachers from the University of Utah. They are listed in order of frequency of mention, with the most frequent responses listed first.

Table 3

Response from Cooperating Teachers with Student
Teachers from the University of Utah

Weak Areas	Strong Areas	Suggestions
Handling discipline problems	Writing objectives, planning	More experience in a high school classroom before student teaching
Setting up a lab	Clothing techniques	Longer student teaching
Classroom management	Media, creative ideas	More training in psychology and how to deal with students from different backgrounds
Knowing <u>why</u> things happen	Looking and acting professional	Machine repair and other mechanics of home economics
Demonstration techniques		Training in demonstration techniques
Relating to students on their level		
Understanding students from different cultures		
Basic food techniques		

Discipline, setting up a lab, and classroom management are the areas in which student teachers from the University of Utah have the most problems. They appear strongest in planning and writing objectives. They are also stronger in clothing than in the other areas of home economics. Several cooperating teachers commented on the creative use of media displayed by student teachers. Suggestions for improving the program centered mainly on more in-classroom experience before student teaching and for a longer period of student teaching.

Utah State University

Table 4 shows the response from cooperating teachers having

student teachers from Utah State University. The responses are given in order of frequency of mention.

Table 4

Response from Cooperating Teachers with Student Teachers from Utah State University

Weak Areas	Strong Areas	Suggestions
Basic clothing techniques	Foods	Longer student teaching
Consumer techniques	Family and child	Teach sewing machine repair
Classroom management	Workable plans	Encourage to leave college life behind while student teaching
Lab organization	Visual aids, resources	
Demonstrating	New techniques	More experience in a high school classroom before student teaching
Advanced clothing		
Voice projection		Give help in evaluation
Pattern alteration		

Clothing techniques is the area in which students from USU seem to be weakest. Consumer techniques was also found to be lacking. The areas of food and family and child development were listed as strong. All aspects of daily and unit planning for classroom use were also strong.

The most common suggestion for improving the teacher training program was to allow more time for student teaching. The need for training in sewing machine repair was also stressed.

Brigham Young University

Table 5 lists the response from cooperating teachers who had student

teachers from Brigham Young University. The comments are given in the order of frequency of mention.

Table 5
Response from Cooperating Teachers with Student
Teachers from Brigham Young University

Weak Areas	Strong Areas	Suggestions
Clothing construction, fitting	Lesson plans	Need skill experience
Basic food preparation	Child care	Would like to meet student teachers earlier
Evaluation	Home management	Too much paper work that must be turned in to the university
Consumer techniques	Interior decorating	Need more time for observation
Operation of basic equipment, sewing machine	Good attitude	Need help in understanding students
Methods of setting up a lab	Family relations	Need help with discipline
Management of department	Bulletin boards, visuals	Classes need to be more relevant to present society
Demonstration techniques		More emphasis on consumer education techniques
Handling discipline problems		

Students from BYU appear to often lack experience in basic clothing and foods skills and in the handling of equipment and sewing machines. They also have problems with evaluating student behavior and consumer education technique. Planning is rated extremely strong for these students, as in child care. Besides needing skill experience, the

teachers from BYU may be given too many plans and reports to hand in while student teaching. (They expressed a need for a shorter plan form.) The cooperating teachers would also like to be able to meet their student teachers sooner than they do at present.

Summary

Many of the comments are very similar for all three universities. All student teachers appear to do a good job of planning and writing objectives, but have problems with such things as discipline, evaluation, demonstrating, managing a department, and setting up a lab. They also have trouble operating some of the basic equipment and sewing machines used in secondary home economics facilities.

Clothing is a weak subject area for BYU and USU. BYU and U of U are somewhat weak in the area of foods. Consumer education could use improvement in all three schools, while training in family and child development is strong across the state.

The desire for a longer student teaching period was expressed by the cooperating teachers from USU and U of U. Cooperating teachers having student teachers from BYU suggest that the paper work required during student teaching be cut down. All expressed some desire for more experience in a high school classroom before student teaching.

Analysis of Open-ended Questions Given to Senior Home Economics Education Students

University of Utah

Table 6 lists the response of senior students in home economics education at the University of Utah. The comments are listed in order of frequency of mention.

Table 6

Response from Senior Students Attending the
University of Utah

Useless Courses	Duplications	Apprehensions
Educational values	Home Economics 111 ¹ and Home Economics 314 ²	Discipline
Educational psychology	Educational Psychology and other education courses	Relating to students
Introduction to Economics	Home Economics 171 ³ and Home Economics 375 ⁴	Getting respect from students

Suggestions

Earlier opportunity to work with teens.

More help with principle of discipline.

Need to take more home economics courses

Update all classes to include new advancements and make practical
to homemaking in the 70's.

Students at the University of Utah find some of their education
courses to be of not much value and repetitious in the area of
educational psychology. Some duplication occurs in the areas of
family relations and home management, but little concern was expressed
about duplications. Their desire for an earlier opportunity to work
with teenagers and for help with discipline reflects apprehensions
regarding discipline and relating to students. They also suggest the
need to take more home economics courses. They feel the courses are
offered but they do not have time to take all they need.

Utah State University

Table 7 indicates the response from senior students in home

¹Family Life. ²Marriage and Family Relationships. ³Home Management.
⁴Home Management Experience.

economics education at Utah State University. Responses are listed in order of frequency of mention.

Table 7
Response from Senior Students Attending Utah State University

Useless Courses	Duplications	Apprehensions
Clothing & Textiles 106 ¹	Nutrition courses	Discipline
Psychology 106 ²	Public Health 152 ⁵ and Public Health 155 ⁶	Teaching clothing and textiles
Education 101 ³	Foods courses	Relating to students
Psychology 100 ⁴	Education courses	Understanding students
		General fund of know- ledge
		Setting up a lab
		Methods to use when teaching various topics

Suggestions

Give an earlier chance to see if one likes teaching

Need more doing, less theory

Give specific teaching methods for each area of home economics

Discuss discipline

Need more home economics education courses before student teaching

Need more observation

Have a chemistry class for home economics majors

Allow for individual differences in capabilities when setting up coursework by not requiring all the same courses for everyone

Clothing and Textiles 106 was listed by students at USU as a class with little value. Psychology 106 also was regarded as poor. There seems

¹Behavioral Science Aspects of Clothing. ²Educational Psychology.
³Foundation Studies in Teaching. ⁴Human Growth and Development. ⁵Family Health. ⁶Health Education for Teachers.

to be some overlapping in the foods and nutrition courses, in some health courses, and in the education courses. Discipline was the students' major concern, but many also worried about teaching clothing and textiles. The most frequent suggestion was for an earlier opportunity to work in a secondary classroom. The need for more practical experience in the skill areas like clothing and foods and specific teaching methods for the different areas were also stressed.

Brigham Young University

Table 8 lists the responses from senior home economics education students at Brigham Young University. Again, the responses are given in order of frequency of mention.

Table 8

Response from Senior Home Economics Education
Students Attending Brigham Young University

Useless Courses	Duplications	Apprehensions
Most education courses	Child Development & Family Relations courses and Psychology	Discipline
Home Economics 101 ¹		Evaluation
Home Management 350 ²	Health courses and nursing	Relating to students
	Home Economics 101 and upper division classes	What to teach to whom

Suggestions

Know student teaching assignment further in advance

More training in principles of teaching gainful home economics

Room for a minor in one's curriculum

Course markings in Home Management course should be pass/fail, and also in Student Teaching

¹Concepts of Home Economics Education. ²Principles of Home Management.

Less written work to be turned in during student teaching

More room for electives in the total curriculum

Almost all of the education courses were listed by some students as being of little value. Duplications were said to occur between Child Development and Family Relations classes and psychology and between the health and nursing courses. Apprehensions include discipline, evaluation, and understanding the secondary student. Suggestions included: knowing one's student teaching assignment further in advance; having more training in teaching gainful home economics; and allowing room for a minor in one's curriculum. It was also suggested that less written work be turned in during student teaching experience.

Summary

Most of the home economics education students in all three universities feel that most of their classes have been beneficial to them. Education courses (general) seem to be the most criticized as being of little use. Students suggest that often it is the teacher's fault if the course is not as good as it should be, but that the material in most of the courses is necessary.

There was also little concern about duplication. The general feeling is that some duplication is necessary or unavoidable. A few courses were listed as overlapping one another more than necessary.

Student discipline was the chief apprehension of students in each school. Students also feared they would not be able to relate to students or evaluate their progress properly. Suggestions varied somewhat from school to school, but all seemed to want to have an

earlier opportunity to find out if they liked teaching.

Analysis of Comments Made by Secondary Teachers

University of Utah

Table 9 gives the response from secondary teachers of homemaking who graduated from the University of Utah. They are listed in order of frequency of mention.

Table 9

Comments by Secondary Teachers Who Graduated from the University of Utah

Home Economics Subject Matter	Educational Subject Matter
Additional concentration or increased time needed:	Additional concentration or increased time needed:
Consumer Education Techniques	Methods to make Home Economics interesting
Alterations & Fitting	Education classes specific to subject matter field
Comprehensive Home Furnishings	Media classes
Home Management	Evaluations
Drug Education	Other:
Manners and Grooming	Educational Psychology without value
Handicrafts	Cooperating teachers need to allow more freedom in planning to student teachers
Gainful Home Economics	
Other:	
Chemistry is not relevant	

Comments by the secondary teachers who graduated from the University of Utah tended to be quite varied, but one response that appeared consistently was in regard to the need for more consumer education. There also seemed to be general agreement that the education classes needed

to be improved. The other items in Table 9 were mentioned several times, but not in an overwhelming number.

Utah State University

Table 10 lists the comments from secondary teachers of home economics who graduated from USU. They are listed in order of frequency of mention.

Table 10

Comments from Secondary Teachers who Graduated
from Utah State University

Required Home Economics Subject Matter	Education Subject Matter
Need more consumer buying	Need to take course on audio- visuals
Need chemistry oriented for Home Education majors	Educational Psychology was not relevant
Need more on drugs	Need discussion on discipline
Need more on careers for world of work unit	Student teaching was too short
Credit in Home Management course should be marked pass/fail	More and better psychology classes needed
Need training for teaching gainful home economics	
Need help with quick and easy recipes	
Need sewing machine repair techniques	
Required classes didn't fill needs in clothing	

Secondary teachers who graduated from USU also pointed out the need for more education on consumer education techniques. They also indicated a need for a chemistry class orientated toward home economics

majors. Drug education was also desired. They suggested the need for a course on audio-visuals and also the need to make educational psychology more relevant.

Brigham Young University

Table 11 gives the comments made by secondary teachers of homemaking who graduated from Brigham Young University. The responses are listed in order of frequency of mention.

Table 11

Comments from Secondary Teachers who Graduated
from Brigham Young University

Home Economics Subject Matter	Education Subject Matter
Need more teaching techniques for sewing	Need more time on techniques in each area
Need much more on the teaching of gainful Home Economics for teachers	Need assistance in formulating sequence for instruction
Need more and greater variety of instruction in clothing	Need earlier orientation toward education, instead of just in the final quarters
Need to have an integrated approach to teaching values and decision-making instead of limiting to home management	Some unnecessary busywork in student teaching
Need more on drugs	Need more on what to teach to whom
Need more on careers	Need more audio-visual
Need to teach needlecraft	
Need more on different life patterns and cultures	
Need help in Future Homemakers of America incorporated into secondary program	

In the area of subject matter, secondary teachers who graduated from Brigham Young University reflected a desire for a broader program in the area of clothing and textiles. The greatest need, according to them, is in the area of education for gainful employment, including how to operate certain types of industrial equipment. They also suggested the need for time spent on techniques for teaching each of the areas and on sequence for instruction.

Summary of Comparisons Between the Three Schools

The results of this study indicate that for the most part the same areas are neglected or in need of improvement in all three universities. These areas include evaluation, discussion of discipline problems, educational psychology, and gainful home economics in the area of education. Respondents from all three schools also expressed a desire for instruction in sewing machine repair and other aspects of department management. There also appeared to be general agreement that almost all courses need to be re-evaluated and made more relevant to today's problems, because almost all courses are teaching things that are no longer practical to the modern homemaker. Stress also needs to be placed on such areas as drug education in order to equip the teacher to deal with the problems of today's youth.

All three schools also agreed on many of the areas which are strong. Most frequently mentioned was that good training was being given in developing workable lesson plans for teaching. Many respondents also indicated that student teachers were coming out with creative ideas.

Respondents from the University of Utah indicated that the clothing area was strong, but they stated a need for a lot more training in

consumer technique. The area of the family and child generally had few criticisms, except that it did not deal enough with other culture patterns.

Clothing was also described as a weak area by those responding from Brigham Young University. Foods was also somewhat lacking, but the family and child areas were rated high. It was generally felt that this school should simplify the planning form required of student teachers, because they had too much written work to be turned in during this time.

Analysis of Rating Scale

An analysis was made of the results of the response to the scale by secondary teachers who are presently teaching home economics in Utah and graduated from one of the universities included in the study. The analysis included the computing of means and correlations for the items on the scale.

Adequacy of Program Provided

Each teacher rated each item on the scale according to the adequacy of her college training in that area. The possible range of scores for each item was from one to five, with the higher numbers indicating a well-rounded and complete program, and the lower numbers designating programs that were lacking. Table 13 gives the mean for each item on the scale. The mean is listed for each school and for the total sample.

Table 13

Mean Scores on Adequacy of Training for Each Item on the Scale

Area of Training	USU	U of U	BYU	Total Sample
<u>Foods</u>				
Principles of cookery	4.50	4.19	3.83	4.12
Skills	3.96	3.69	3.47	3.69
Nutrition	4.46	3.94	4.50	4.36
Meal Service	4.08	4.00	4.38	4.19
Buying food	3.39	4.07	3.21	3.46
Quantity cooking	1.96	2.25	1.77	1.93
Food service	1.75	2.08	1.92	1.89
Convenience foods	3.13	3.07	2.97	3.05
Chemistry	3.95	3.00	3.90	3.70
Bacteriology	3.39	2.00	3.70	3.23
Sequence for instruction	2.80	3.43	2.91	3.04
Total mean	3.46	3.31	3.41	
<u>Clothing</u>				
Methods	4.00	4.00	3.93	3.97
Skills	4.08	4.19	4.04	4.08
Textiles	3.75	4.25	4.38	4.13
Buying clothes	3.36	3.06	3.07	3.17
Alterations	2.71	2.38	3.00	2.74
Power machines	1.28	1.00	1.44	1.28
Needlecraft	1.40	1.53	1.35	1.40
Line and design	3.70	3.60	4.10	3.85
Mending	1.60	1.40	1.75	1.62
Art	3.04	2.29	3.12	2.91
Sequence for instruction	3.58	3.05	3.09	3.04
Total mean	2.93	2.84	3.08	
<u>Child and Family</u>				
Understanding self & others	3.88	3.19	3.80	3.69
Dating and mate selection	3.76	3.19	4.07	3.76
Marriage & family	4.16	3.53	4.00	3.96
Child rearing	3.96	3.94	4.25	4.07
Nursery school	4.40	4.13	4.72	4.48
Cultural patterns	3.24	2.79	3.10	3.09
Sequence for instruction	3.58	3.50	3.56	3.57
Total mean	3.86	3.45	3.93	
<u>Home Management</u>				
Values, goals	4.44	3.73	3.83	4.03
Equipment	4.38	3.13	4.59	4.17
Credit, insurance	4.16	3.75	3.76	3.90
Home furnishings	3.79	3.20	3.89	3.70

Table 13 (continued) Mean scores on adequacy of training for each item on the scale

Area of Training	USU	U of U	BYU	Total Sample
Care of home	3.04	3.53	3.03	3.15
Laundry	2.72	3.56	3.52	3.24
Consumer problems	3.88	3.13	3.07	3.37
Home management house	4.64	4.00	4.21	4.31
Sequence for instruction	3.41	3.33	3.48	3.42
Total mean	3.85	3.49	3.73	
<u>Others</u>				
Health, first aid	3.13	4.07	4.14	3.76
Grooming, manners	3.08	2.47	3.00	2.91
Drugs, alcohol	2.16	1.53	2.10	2.00
Careers	2.16	2.13	2.25	2.19
H. E. philosophy	3.48	3.27	3.97	3.64
<u>Teacher Training</u>				
Vocational program	2.96	2.40	3.26	2.96
H. E. methods	4.17	3.50	4.17	4.01
Gainful H. E.	2.44	2.81	3.11	2.80
Educational psych.	3.42	3.13	3.03	3.19
Tests, measurements	2.88	3.44	3.03	3.07
Student teaching	4.50	4.38	4.59	4.51
Curriculum planning	4.08	3.50	3.72	3.80
Instructional media	3.00	3.94	3.90	3.60
Extension	2.04	2.07	2.04	2.05
Adult education	1.96	2.33	2.38	2.22
Legislation	2.52	2.15	2.08	2.26
Total mean	3.06	3.11	3.20	
<u>General Education</u>				
Biology	3.95	3.77	3.40	3.70
Zoology	2.34	2.64	3.44	2.86
Physiology	4.30	3.67	2.53	3.54
Ecology	1.56	1.91	1.82	1.75
English composition	3.70	3.40	4.08	3.78
English literature	3.40	3.43	3.17	3.34
Art	3.05	3.67	3.33	3.33
Music	2.59	3.33	2.06	2.57
Political Science and History	3.36	3.60	3.22	3.37
Economics	2.94	3.73	1.72	2.75
Sociology	3.23	3.53	2.18	2.98
Psychology	3.46	3.40	3.13	3.32
Chemistry	4.09	3.50	3.52	3.73
Physics	2.17	2.92	2.24	2.34
Health	3.91	3.86	3.78	3.85
Speech	3.44	3.79	3.63	3.61
Total mean	3.39	3.41	3.14	

Those means which were below 3.00 are those in which many necessary aspects have been omitted in the college training. Most of these areas were the same for all three universities. They included quantity cooking, food service, alterations, power machines, needlecraft, and mending. Also included were grooming and manners, drugs and alcohol, careers, vocational and gainful home economics, adult education, educational legislation, and ecology.

Those items which had means above 4.00 are those areas in which very good college training has been provided. Many of these were also the same for all three schools. They were principles of cookery, nutrition, meal service, clothing skills, and textiles. Also good were child rearing, nursery school and day care, the home management house, and student teaching. While there is undoubtedly room for improvement in these areas, they may be considered adequate as they are now.

When the total means for the various departments within home economics were compared, there was little difference among them. However, in general it seemed that the area of clothing and textiles needed the most improvement, while the areas of child and family and household economics and management appeared to require the least improvement.

The above mentions apply very well to Utah State University. One area that appeared to be lacking more at USU than the other schools was laundry. It was also weak in tests and measurements and health.

The University of Utah had some areas that appeared very well done in comparison to the other schools, but it also had several areas in which it rated somewhat lower than the others. These were nutrition,

bacteriology, the areas involving self, marriage, and other cultures, equipment, and home furnishings. Also weaker were home economics methods for teaching, and manners and grooming.

The weakest areas for Brigham Young University besides those previously listed for all the schools were principles of cookery, physiology, and economics. Sociology was also weak.

The areas rated between 3.00 and 4.00 can be described as fair. They have many good points, but should be given thorough examination, and attention should be given to parts of these areas which need improvement. A few improvements could give these areas an excellent rating. These areas were generally the same for all three schools. They include buying clothes, line and design in fashion, sequence for instruction in all areas, understanding of self and others and dating and mate selection. Also in this group were cultural patterns, credit and insurance, home furnishings and the other areas of home management including consumer buying. The philosophy of home economics was included in this group, as were educational psychology, tests and measurements, curriculum planning, and instructional media.

Relevancy of Program Provided

Each secondary teacher also rated her college training for relevancy, or the degree to which the subject matter was presented in a manner harmonious with her needs. Again, the possible range of scores was from one to five. Table 14 gives the means for all the items on the scale for relevancy.

Those areas which had the lowest means on relevancy ratings included quantity cooking, food service, chemistry, power machines, needlecraft, and mending. Also low were adult education and legislation. Some of

these areas were also described as inadequate, indicating that these subject areas are important, but are not presently being taught in a manner which meets the teacher's needs.

The most relevant areas were principles of cookery, nutrition, meal service, clothing methods and skills, marriage and family, and child rearing. Also very relevant were nursery school, equipment, budgeting, home economics methods for teaching, and student teaching.

The relevancy scores were usually a bit higher than the adequacy scores. As Table 14 indicates, only one relevancy score was lower than 2.00.

Note: Relevancy is used here to indicate how well the course as taught met their needs--something rated low in relevancy may need to be taught, but in a more relevant manner--the information is important, but the method of teaching it is poor.

Table 14

Mean Scores on Relevancy of Training for Each Item on the Scale

Area of Training	USU	U of U	BYU	Total Sample
<u>Foods</u>				
Principles of cookery	4.42	4.19	3.83	4.12
Skills	4.21	3.94	3.72	3.94
Nutrition	4.29	3.81	4.37	4.21
Meal Service	4.25	4.06	4.37	4.26
Buying food	3.82	4.14	3.47	3.73
Quantity cooking	2.63	3.22	2.63	2.75
Food service	2.33	2.80	2.78	2.61
Convenience foods	3.79	3.00	2.32	3.40
Chemistry	3.52	2.18	2.96	2.97
Bacteriology	3.44	1.83	3.26	3.05
Sequence for instruction	4.20	3.00	2.90	3.25
Total mean	3.72	3.40	3.55	
<u>Clothing</u>				
Methods	4.28	3.81	4.18	4.13
Skills	4.32	4.06	4.36	4.28
Textiles	3.80	4.06	4.03	3.96

Table 14 (continued) Mean Scores on Relevancy of Training for Each Item on the Scale

Area of Training	USU	U of U	BYU	Total Sample
Buying clothes	3.59	3.27	3.50	3.48
Alterations	3.59	2.93	3.77	3.49
Power machines	1.90	1.56	2.12	1.91
Needlecraft	2.45	2.36	2.00	2.28
Line and design	3.96	3.64	4.00	3.91
Mending	2.55	2.20	2.37	2.41
Art	3.43	2.62	3.48	3.27
Sequence for instruction	3.75	3.54	3.63	3.65
Total mean	3.48	3.24	3.61	
<u>Child and Family</u>				
Understanding self and others	4.32	3.38	3.96	3.96
Dating, mate selection	3.88	3.25	4.17	3.86
Marriage, family	4.16	3.47	4.07	4.00
Child rearing	4.67	3.94	4.32	4.18
Nursery school	4.56	4.20	4.71	4.54
Cultural patterns	3.67	3.17	3.50	3.50
Sequence for instruction	3.76	3.77	3.79	3.78
Total mean	4.07	3.56	4.09	
<u>Home Management</u>				
Values, goals	4.40	3.93	3.41	3.84
Equipment	4.42	3.43	4.69	4.33
Budgeting	4.30	4.00	3.79	4.01
Credit, insurance	3.92	3.75	3.62	3.75
Home furnishings	4.04	3.54	4.11	3.97
Care of home	3.91	3.64	3.36	3.61
Laundry	3.65	4.00	3.71	3.76
Consumer problems	4.17	3.64	3.42	3.75
Home management house	4.60	4.13	3.59	4.07
Sequence for instruction	4.00	3.50	3.75	3.78
Total mean	4.13	3.74	3.74	
<u>Others</u>				
Health, first aid	3.61	3.73	4.00	3.80
Grooming, manners	3.91	3.15	3.56	3.60
Drugs, alcohol	3.43	2.39	2.92	2.99
Careers	3.52	2.62	2.92	3.07
Home economics philosophy	3.80	3.19	3.64	3.60

Table 14 (continued) Mean Scores on Relevancy of Training for Each Item on the Scale

Area of Training	USU	U of U	BYU	Total Sample
<u>Teacher Training</u>				
Vocational program	3.80	3.08	3.31	3.42
Home Economics methods	4.46	3.60	3.96	4.05
Gainful Home Economics	3.67	3.47	3.16	3.40
Educational psychology	3.60	2.94	3.07	3.05
Tests, measurements	3.14	3.27	3.28	3.23
Student teaching	4.70	4.31	4.29	4.43
Curriculum planning	4.21	3.69	3.76	3.90
Instructional media	4.00	4.20	3.97	4.03
Extension	2.72	2.30	2.80	2.67
Adult Education	3.10	2.73	2.73	2.87
Legislation	2.89	2.70	2.38	2.64
Total mean	3.56	3.47	3.42	
<u>General Education</u>				
Biology	3.50	3.39	3.40	3.43
Zoology	2.33	2.20	3.38	2.82
Physiology	3.90	3.47	3.14	3.55
Ecology	2.46	2.60	3.08	2.71
English composition	3.85	3.43	4.04	3.83
English literature	3.27	3.31	3.64	3.42
Art	3.84	3.71	3.60	3.71
Music	3.13	3.00	2.70	2.95
Political science and history	3.27	3.50	3.00	3.22
Economics	3.56	3.40	2.90	3.34
Sociology	3.57	3.33	3.09	3.38
Psychology	3.24	3.40	3.32	3.31
Chemistry	3.57	2.93	3.38	3.34
Physics	3.14	2.73	2.87	2.93
Health	3.76	4.00	3.77	3.83
Speech	3.65	3.93	4.06	3.88

Relationship Between Adequacy and Relevancy

Most of the items on the scale received similar responses for both adequacy and relevancy; however, the relevancy score was usually higher than the adequacy score. The exceptions were nutrition, chemistry, bacteriology, textiles, values, goals, decision-making, and credit,

insurance, and legalities. Also rated lower on relevancy than on adequacy were the home management house, educational psychology, and biology. For these areas, it appears that more changes are needed to make the program more relevant than to make it more adequate.

When the adequacy and relevancy scores were correlated, a positive correlation that was significant at the .05 alpha level was found for most of the items. A table provided by the University of Utah Computer Center was used to determine at which point a correlation coefficient became significant. At most cases, it was at about a $-.40$ or $+.40$ correlation. Those which were not significantly correlated for USU were convenience foods, chemistry, and sequence for instruction in foods. Others not significantly correlated were art, marriage and family, child rearing, careers, educational psychology, legislation, English composition, art, music, political science and history, and physics. The correlations were determined on the basis of each individual's rating for adequacy and relevancy per item.

For the University of Utah principles of cookery was negatively correlated at a .05 level of significance. Those items which were not correlated at a significant level of at least .05 were foods skills, food service, chemistry, power machines, art, child rearing, and philosophy of home economics. Also not positively correlated were vocational program, home economics methods for teaching, tests and measurements, student teaching, curriculum planning, instructional media, and legislation.

Data for BYU showed only one area which was not positively correlated at at least a .05 level of significance. This was careers. All the other items were positively correlated in regard to individuals' ratings of adequacy and relevancy for each item.

When the total means for the various departments were correlated for adequacy and relevancy, all departments were positively correlated at at least a .05 level of significance. There was one exception, and this was the general education at Utah State. It was correlated positively, but not at a significant level of at least .05.

Comparison of First, Third, and Fifth Year Teachers

There was little difference between the ratings for both adequacy and relevancy of the first year teachers and those who had taught for three or five years. However, the first year teachers tended to rate most items slightly higher than those who had taught longer. This may indicate that some improvement has taken place in the training program in the past few years.

Those areas scored consistantly higher in both areas by the first year teachers included buying food, quantity cooking, sequence for instruction in foods, power machines, line and design, values, goals and decision-making, credit and insurance, and consumer problems. Also rated higher by the first year teachers were the vocational home economics program funded by the Federal and State special monies, home economics methods, the cooperative extension service, legislation, and ecology. Most of these represent areas which are becoming more important to the field of home economics and still need increased emphasis.

A few areas were rated noticeably lower by the first year teacher than those who had taught longer. These included chemistry, understanding self and others, cultural patterns, grooming and manners, and philosophy of home economics.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Scope of the Study

This study had as its goals the analysis of the relevancy and adequacy of the teacher training programs in Utah for teachers of home economics at the secondary level and the identification and presentation of suggestions for improvement. It is felt that, within the evident limitations of the data presented, these goals have been achieved.

The sample consisted of senior students in home economics education, cooperating teachers supervising student teachers, and practicing secondary teachers who graduated from Utah State University, the University of Utah, or Brigham Young University.

The instruments used were a rating scale for adequacy and relevancy of college training and a questionnaire consisting of several open-ended items. A review was also made of the syllabi for the courses in home economics at each of the universities and the secondary curriculum guides currently in use in Utah. A tape recording of a discussion with student teachers about their college training was also reviewed.

Findings

The programs were found to be very good in most areas, but some areas need improvement. These findings were quite varied and are discussed in detail in the section entitled FINDINGS. Suggestions for improvement of the training programs are listed in the next section of this report.

Recommendations

The following suggestions appear to merit the most attention based

on results of this study. Unless specified otherwise, these suggestions refer to all three schools. The findings point out other areas which also could use improvement, and interested persons should note carefully those which apply to them.

It is recommended that:

1. Teaching methods taught be as specific to the subject area as possible. Benefit might be received by having fewer education classes of a general nature and more specifically home economics oriented education classes. The teaching of clothing methods, foods methods, could be incorporated into course requirements in their specific fields.
2. A course in gainful home economics be required. This can combine teaching methods and experience with food service, power machines, etc.
3. The program be made more flexible to meet individual needs. Pre-tests should be used more to determine which students need more basic skills classes or more training in one area than another.
4. Consumer decision-making be emphasized in all areas, not just in one class.
5. Efforts be made to make class content more current, to include new textiles, food products, etc.
6. Sewing machine repair be included.
7. That students get more experience in fitting others in clothing construction classes. They now often have problems helping their students with fitting.
8. A one hour course in grooming and social usage be offered, if not required.

9. Students get more drug education.

10. The chemistry program be revised. It should not be eliminated, but possibly cut down in required hours or a course of chemistry be taught specifically for home economics majors to help make chemistry more relevant to them.

11. Important classes such as consumer buying, equipment, and food deterioration and preservation be required at all institutions. At the University of Utah, for example, these courses are presently optional.